

## REMARKS

Claim 8 has been re-written in independent form to include all of the limitations of original claim 7. Claims 1-7 and 13-18 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Objections to Claims

Claim 1 (and 7 & 13)

This objection is respectfully traversed with respect to claim 7, the subject matter of which is now included in claim 8. Claims 1 and 13 have been canceled.

The answer to the Examiner's question as to whether:

- a list of candidate third elements  $z$  to be provided to user; wherein said third elements  $z$  in said list are selected. . .” identifies a list, comprising a plurality of elements, the plurality of elements identified as  $z$ ?
- is “yes.” In other words, the claim language means what it says. The phrase “a list of candidate third elements  $z$ ” in fact means a list of candidate third elements identified as  $z$ . What else would it mean?

Similarly, “wherein said third elements  $z$  in said list are selected. . .” means that one or more elements may be selected, and “said list enabling the user to select any of the third elements” means that *any* of the third elements may be selected. The claim language does not say “one” third element, but to the contrary states that one can any of the candidates  $z$  to the document because all of the candidates  $z$  by definition have relationships to  $z_i$  and  $z_{i=1}$  that comply with DTD. Therefore, none of the objected-to language in claim 7, now included in claim 8, is believed to be confusing, and withdrawal of the objection set forth in item 2 on page 2 of the Official Action is respectfully requested.

If claim language has a specific meaning, and the meaning can easily be understood (the Examiner's question shows that the Examiner understood its meaning), then the claim language can hardly be considered confusing. The Examiner does not propose any reasonable alternative meanings that would render the language ambiguous, and none is believed to exist. While it is true that the claim language needs to be read carefully to understand it, the reason is that the subject matter of the claim is complex and not that the language used to describe that subject matter in any way improper or indefinite.

Claim 8

This objection has been addressed by adding the missing notation between p and N in line 3, namely the symbol €.

2. New Matter Objection

This objection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1 and 13, although the Applicant respectfully notes that it makes no sense to rejection claims as being directed to software and then object to a recitation that the software is stored on a computer readable medium. Anyone skilled in the art would understand that software in fact must be stored on a computer readable medium, and that a description of a software program implies such a medium. How else does the Examiner think that a XML document editing software program would be implemented? Of course, the medium could be an optical disc, a magnetic storage elements, or even an EEPROM, so long as the medium is computer readable, but the fact that different media could be used does not justify an objection to the recitation of a "computer readable medium" as new matter.

3. Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 13-18 Under 35 USC §101

This rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1-6 and 13-18 although the Applicant respectfully notes that the detailed description of an XML document editor clearly supports a recitation of storage on a computer readable medium.

